

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-16 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent. In the Office Action dated May 24, 2007, Claims 7-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-16 remain in this application with Claim 2-4 and 8-10 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Godbold for the courtesy of a telephone interview on August 7, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

In the Office Action dated May 24, 2007, the Examiner stated that the Information Disclosure Statement dated May 4, 2006, failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98 because the 1449 form was missing. Applicants respectfully submit that the Information Disclosure Statement dated May 4, 2006, did not require a 1449 form because it included a statement regarding non-public use.

III. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 7 has been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

IV. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 5-8, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0039996 ("*Flam*"). In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-4, 9-10, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Flam* in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0143825 ("*Fienberg*"). Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein determining a reading order comprises, evaluating successively, by the computer system, a plurality of characters comprising the mixed language text message to determine whether ones of the plurality of characters comprise one of the following: a strong character and a weak character, determining, by the computer system, the language of a first strong character in the plurality of characters encountered during the successive evaluation, and establishing the reading order based upon a language corresponding to the first strong character." Amended Claim 7 includes a similar recitation. Furthermore, amended Claim 1 is

patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "ascertaining by the computer system at least one of the following: a language to which the located alphabetic character belongs and a script to which the located alphabetic character belongs." Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 11, lines 13-24.

In contrast, *Flam* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Flam* merely discloses that Hebrew letters in a passage 54 are displayed from left to right, presumably because a passage in a site 52 is represented by a logical font, while window 56 is set to receive a visual font, or vice versa. (See paragraph [0061].) To overcome this problem, in *Flam*, mouse 25 is used to select a "switch" button 62 in window 56 that reverses the order of the Hebrew letters. (See paragraph [0062].) In *Flam*, establishing a reading order based upon a language corresponding to a first strong character determined by a computer system is not disclosed. Rather *Flam* merely discloses a user selecting a "switch" button to reverse Hebrew letter order. *Flam* does not disclose the computer determining a language, rather the user decides whether to select a "switch" button.

Furthermore, *Fienberg* does not overcome *Flam*'s deficiencies. *Fienberg* merely discloses, with respect to text rendered according to the rules of the Hebrew language, a module 205 scans every character looking for a dash "-." (See paragraph [0032].) When module 205 in *Fienberg* locates a dash, the text including the dash is highlighted and the user is given a prompt to ask the user whether the text surrounding the dash should be reversed or flipped into a left-to-right configuration. (See paragraph [0032].) Like *Flam*, *Fienberg* at least does not teach or suggest establishing a reading order

based upon a language corresponding to a first strong character determined by a computer system. Rather *Fienberg* merely discloses that when a dash is discovered, the text including the dash is highlighted and the user is given a prompt to ask the user whether the text surrounding the dash should be reversed.

Combining *Flam* with *Fienberg* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Flam* and *Fienberg*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "wherein determining a reading order comprises, evaluating successively, by the computer system, a plurality of characters comprising the mixed language text message to determine whether ones of the plurality of characters comprise one of the following: a strong character and a weak character, determining, by the computer system, the language of a first strong character in the plurality of characters encountered during the successive evaluation, and establishing the reading order based upon a language corresponding to the first strong character," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 7 includes a similar recitation. Furthermore, combining *Flam* with *Fienberg* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Flam* and *Fienberg*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "ascertaining by the computer system at least one of the following: a language to which the located alphabetic character belongs and a script to which the located alphabetic character belongs," as recited by amended Claim 13. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 7, and 13 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 7, and 13.

Dependent Claims 5-6, 11-12, and 14-16 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 7, and 13, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 7, and 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 5-6, 11-12, and 14-16.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: August 24, 2007

/D. Kent Stier/

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

